REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8 are pending. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 4 and 8 are allowable.

By this Amendment, claims 4 and 8 are rewritten in independent form. Claims 3 and 7 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Daiber (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,664). The rejection of claims 3 and 7 is moot, because these claims have been canceled. The rejection of claims 1-2 and 5-6 are respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, claim 1 recites "encoded patterns having a different number of ON pixels are allowed to be present at the same time in the unit pixel block to record the two-dimensional image." Claim 5 recites "encoded patterns having a different number of ON pixels in the unit pixel block being allowed to be present at the same time."

The Office Action asserts that Daiber teaches "encoded patterns having a different number of ON pixels are allowed to be present at the same time in the unit pixel block to record the two-dimensional image" (col. 3, line 62 - col. 4, line 52). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In col. 4, lines 49-52, Daiber states "the important point about the conversion of the data groups to the binary patterns is that each binary pattern has fewer 'on' channel bits than 'off' channel bits." Thus, Daiber merely shows an image model of a spatial light modulator, and does not disclose "encoded patterns having a different number of ON pixels are allowed to be present at the same time in the unit pixel block to record the two-dimensional image."

Further, Daiber, col. 3, line 60, and col. 4, line 52 discloses encoded patterns having a different number of ON pixels. However, the number of ON pixels to be present at the same time in the unit pixel block is the same as shown in Fig. 2 of Daiber. Thus, Daiber fails to

disclose "encoded patterns having a different number of ON pixels are allowed to be present at the same time in the unit pixel block to record the two-dimensional image."

Regarding claims 2 and 6, claim 2 recites that "when the number of pixels forming the unit pixel block is n, the number of the encoded patterns is a total sum of $_{n}C_{0}$ to $_{n}C_{n}$." Claim 6 recites that "when the number of pixels in the unit pixel block is n, the spatial light modulator is configured to display encoded patterns of types equal in number to a total sum N of $_{n}C_{0}$ to $_{n}C_{n}$." The Office Action asserts that Daiber, col. 4, lines 53-67, discloses that when the number of pixels forming the unit pixel blocks is n, the number of the encoded patterns is a total of $_{n}C_{0}$ to $_{n}C_{n}$. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Daiber, col. 4, lines 53-67, discloses the number of the combination of the encoded patterns, but does not disclose the number of ON pixels to be present at the same time. Thus, Daiber does not disclose that "when the number of pixels forming the unit pixel block is n, the number of the encoded patterns is a total sum of $_{n}C_{0}$ to $_{n}C_{n}$." Thus, the Office Action's assertion is not factually supported.

Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Abdul Q. Basit

Registration No. 61,788

JAO:AQB/hjr

Date: July 17, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 320850 Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461